

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ROUTHA ROUSSAW,
Petitioner,

v.

PALOKOVICH, *et al.*,
Respondents.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION 04-CV-3696

ORDER

AND NOW, this **5th** day of **August, 2020**, in consideration of Petitioner Routha Roussaw's Motion for Relief from Judgment Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) (ECF No. 43), it is **ORDERED** that:

1. The Motion is **DISMISSED** for lack of jurisdiction for the reasons set forth in the Court's Memorandum accompanying this Order.¹

2. A Certificate of Appealability is **DENIED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) because reasonable jurists would not debate the propriety of this Court's procedural ruling with respect to these claims. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ **Eduardo C. Robreno**
EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

¹ Petitioner is advised that if he wishes to raise the arguments addressed in his motion, he must first receive authorization from the Court of Appeals to file another federal habeas petition. See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A)